

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,291	03/04/2002	Leonel Ernesto Enriquez	50136SE1764TL	6622
27975	7590 04/04/2005		EXAM	INER
ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A. 1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE			BRINEY III, WALTER F	
P.O. BOX 3		RANGE AVENUE	<u> </u>	PAPER NUMBER
ORLANDO	, FL 32802-3791	2-3791 2644		
			DATE MAILED: 04/04/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				<u>///</u>			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/090,291	ENRIQUEZ ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Walter F Briney III	2644				
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address				
THE - Ext afte - If th - If N - Fail Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR IT MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days to period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of the period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC y statute, cause the application to become a	a reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.			
Status							
1)🖾	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	1 22 December 2004.					
2a)□		This action is non-final.					
3)□							
Disposi	tion of Claims						
5)[• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ithdrawn from consideration.					
Applica	tion Papers						
·	The specification is objected to by the Ex The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the o The oath or declaration is objected to by	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyon correction is required if the drawing	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121((d).			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
а	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E	uments have been received. uments have been received in e priority documents have bee Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage				
2) Noti 3) Info	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9- rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ er No(s)/Mail Date	48) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Application/Control Number: 10/090,291

Art Unit: 2644

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takato et al.
 (US Patent 4,631,366) in view of McAndrews (US Patent 5,160,851).

Claim 15 is limited to a circuit arrangement for limiting the DC voltage applied to a tip and ring amplifiers of a subscriber line interface circuit (SLIC) (figure 6, elements A₀, A₁), each having a first polarity input (figure 6, element A₀/A₁, plus terminal) thereof coupled to a first current flow path to which a DC input voltage is coupled. Takato discloses a first current source (figure 6, element Tr₀) that is operative to supply, to a second polarity input node of said tip amplifier (figure 6, element A₀, minus terminal), a first current derived in accordance with that flowing through said first current flow path (figure 6, path from Ra₀ through Ra₁). Takato discloses a second current source (figure 6, element Tr₁) that is operative to supply, to a second polarity input node of said ring amplifier (figure 6, element A₁, minus terminal), a second current derived in accordance with that flowing through said first current flow path (figure 6, path from Ra₀ through Ra₁). While it is noted that the rejection in the previous Final Office action filed 27 July 2004 equates element (IV) of figures 6 and 7 to the voltage regulator recited in this claim, it is clear that element (IV) is incapable of regulating the DC input itself, as the

Art Unit: 2644

currently amended claim recites. Furthermore, Takato fails to disclose any details relating to creating or generating the voltage –V_{BB}. Therefore, Takato anticipates all limitations of the claim with the exception of a *voltage regulator that regulates said DC input from varying above a regulated voltage Vreg*.

McAndrews teaches a rechargeable back-up battery system including a number of battery cells having float voltage exceeding maximum load voltage. See Abstract. In general, the system of McAndrews depicted in figure 1 provides DC power to a general central office load (2). See column 3, lines 52-62. This load corresponds directly to the battery feed circuitry disclosed by Takato. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, Takato does not disclose the origin of supply voltage -V_{BB}. It follows that one of ordinary skill in the art would be inherently motivated to combine a prior art teaching of central office power supply. As such, the teachings of McAndrews provide the necessary supply voltage, and in addition, provide battery backup in the event of loss of AC power, the battery power being regulated to a nominal value by voltage converter (8c) of figure 1. See column 4, lines 15-44, especially lines 39-44.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the rechargeable back-up battery system as taught by McAndrews with the line driving circuitry of Takato because Takato fails to teach how to generate supply voltage –V_{BB} and because the system of McAndrews provides battery backup in the event that AC power is lost.

Claim 16 is limited to the circuit arrangement according to claim 15, as covered by Takato in view of McAndrews. Takato discloses first and second low-pass filters

(figure 6, element Rs₀, C₀ and Rs₁ C₁) respectively coupled with said first and second current sources (figure 6, elements Tr₀ and Tr₁) and being operative to pass DC supply energy (i.e. DC blocking capacitors prevent DC from shunting to ground) (column 6, lines 40-41) and prevent noise (i.e. differential-mode voltage introduced into battery – V_{BB}) from being introduced into the voice paths of said tip and ring amplifiers (column 6, line 26-column 7, line 15). Therefore, Takato in view of McAndrews makes obvious all limitations of the claim.

Claim 17 is limited to the circuit arrangement according to claim 15, as covered by Takato in view of McAndrews. Takato discloses a voltage divider (figure 6, elements Ra₀, Rb₀, Rb₁, Ra₁) to an input terminal of which said DC input voltage is applied (figure 6, element –V_{BB}). Takato also discloses a voltage dividing node (figure 6, element M₂) of which said first polarity inputs of said tip and ring amplifiers are coupled (figure 6, elements A₀/A₁, plus terminals). As seen in figure 1 of McAndrews, the voltage converter (i.e. regulator) is connected to the input of the load in the same fashion as the input voltage -V_{BB} in figures 6 and 7 of Takato (i.e. is coupled to said input terminal of said voltage divider). Therefore, Takato in view of McAndrews makes obvious all limitations of the claim.

Claim 18 is limited to the circuit arrangement according to claim 17, as covered by Takato in view of McAndrews. Takato discloses first and second current sources (figure 6, elements Tr₀ and Tr₁) that produce a first and second current and are controlled by amplifiers A0 and A1, the amplifiers are controlled by currents between M₂

Application/Control Number: 10/090,291 Page 5

Art Unit: 2644

(i.e. *voltage dividing node*), Ground (i.e. *reference node*), and -V_{BB}. Therefore, Takato in view of McAndrews makes obvious all limitations of the claim.

Claim 19 is limited to the circuit arrangement according to claim 15, as covered by Takato in view of McAndrews. Takato discloses a voltage divider (figure 6, elements Ra₀, Rb₀, Rb₁, Ra₁) to an input terminal of which said DC input voltage is applied (figure 6, element –V_{BB}). Takato also discloses a voltage dividing node (figure 6, element M₂) of which said first polarity inputs of said tip and ring amplifiers are coupled (figure 6, elements A₀/A₁, plus terminals). As seen in figure 1 of McAndrews, the voltage converter (i.e. regulator) is connected to the input of the load in the same fashion as the input voltage -V_{BB} in figures 6 and 7 of Takato, and is connected to the voltage dividing node through resistors Ra₁ (i.e. is coupled to said voltage dividing node of said voltage divider). Therefore, Takato in view of McAndrews makes obvious all limitations of the claim.

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 18, as covered by Takato in view of McAndrews, and is rejected for the same reasons.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-20, filed 22 December 2004, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/090,291

Art Unit: 2644

Page 6

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter F Briney III whose telephone number is 571-272-7513. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WFB 3/28/05 SINH TRAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER